FY17 AmeriCorps Grant Review Tool
New or Recompete Applications (Competitive)

Applicant:		Reviewer:	

A. Executive Summary (0%)	While no points will be assigned to this section, reviewers will be asked to examine whether or not the applicant followed the **required** format below, as described in the NOFO.

The **[Name of the organization]** proposes to have **[Number of]** AmeriCorps members who will **[service activities the members will be doing]** in **[the locations the AmeriCorps members will serve]**. At the end of the first program year, the AmeriCorps members will be responsible for **[anticipated outcome of project]**. In addition, the AmeriCorps members will leverage an additional **[number of leveraged volunteers, if applicable]** who will be engaged in **[what the leveraged volunteers will be doing.]**

This program will focus on the CNCS focus area(s) of **[Focus Area(s)]**.* The CNCS investment of **$[amount of request]** will be matched with **$[amount of projected match]**, **$[amount of local, state, and federal funds]** in public funding and **$[amount of non-governmental funds]** in private funding.
If the program is not operating in a CNCS focus area, omit this sentence.

Criteria	Yes/No	If no, please provide comments indicating items that must be changed, added, or removed.	Possible Points	Points Awarded
Executive Summary does not deviate from required format			0	0
		A. Executive Summary (Total Points)	0	0

B. Program Design (50%)	**Responses should be found in the Rationale and Approach (Program Design) narrative section.** Reviewers will consider the quality of the application's response to the criteria below. Do not assume all sub-criteria are of equal value.

1. Need				
Criteria	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses	Possible Points	Points Awarded
The community need is prevalent and severe in communities where members will serve and has been documented with relevant data. "Community" can be a geographic region, a specific population of people, or a combination of both. The applicant organization must document the need it plans to address with its proposed program, whether it is a defined geographic community or a subset of individuals living in a particular area.			2	

2. Intervention				
Criteria	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses	Possible Points	Points Awarded
1. The proposed intervention is clearly described. 2. The proposed intervention aligns with the identified community need.			3	

3. Theory of Change and Logic Model
Responses should be found in the Rational and Approach (Program Design) narrative section AND the Logic Model chart (attached to application). Programs may include short, medium, or long-term outcomes in the Logic Model. While performance measure outcomes should be consistent with the program's theory of change, programs are not required to measure all outcomes that are included in the Logic Model. Applicants with multiple interventions should complete one Logic Model chart which incorporates each intervention. *Logic model content that exceeds three pages will not be reviewed.*

Criteria (19 points possible)	Comments on strengths and weaknesses
The Theory of Change shall address: 1. The applicant's proposed intervention is clearly articulated including the design, target population, and roles of AmeriCorps members and (if applicable) leveraged volunteers. 2. The applicant's intervention is likely to lead to the outcomes identified in the applicant's theory of change. The theory of change should be either evidence-informed or evidence-based, meaning that the proposed intervention is guided by the best available research evidence that supports its effectiveness, as described in the Evidence Base section below. 3. The proposed outcomes articulated in the application narrative and Logic Model represent meaningful progress in addressing the community need identified by the applicant. Applicants should provide rationale for selecting output and outcome targets. Note, recompeting applicants proposing to significantly increase or decrease output and outcome targets from their previous grant must provide a justification for this change. 4. The applicant's AmeriCorps members will produce significant contributions to existing efforts to address the stated problem.	

The Logic Model shall depict:
1. A summary of the community problem/need outlined in the narrative.
2. The inputs or resources that are necessary to deliver the intervention, including but not limited to:
  o Number of locations or sites in which members will provide services
  o Number of AmeriCorps members that will deliver the intervention
3. The core activities that define the intervention or program model that members will implement or deliver, including:
  o The duration of the intervention (e.g., the total number of weeks, sessions or months of the intervention)
  o The dosage of the intervention (e.g., the number of hours per session or sessions per week)
  o The target population for the intervention (e.g., disconnected youth, third graders at a certain reading proficiency level)
4. The measurable outputs that result from delivering the intervention (i.e. number of beneficiaries served.) If applicable, identify which National Performance Measures will be used as output indicators
5. Outcomes that demonstrate changes in knowledge/skill, attitude, behavior, or condition that occur as a result of the intervention. If applicable, identify which National Performance Measures will be used as outcome indicators.	

	Possible Points	Points Awarded
Theory of Change and Logic Model	19	

4. Evidence Base					
Responses should be found in the Rationale and Approach (Program Design) narrative section. Applicants will be awarded up to 12 points for providing evidence that their proposed intervention will lead to the outcomes identified in the logic model.					
Criteria	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses		Possible	Points
Applicants must: 1. State the evidence tier in which they think they qualify; 2. Clearly indicate and describe the evidence that supports the highest evidence tier for which they are eligible; and 3. Describe the complete body of evidence that supports their program intervention including evidence from lower tiers. Applicants should pay particular attention to the requirements for each tier of evidence. More points are awarded for higher tiers of evidence.				**12**	
Please refer to the Grant Review Tool Supplement - Evidence Base Criteria for additional information.					
All applicants must include as much detailed information as possible in the Evidence section of the application. Applicants that have collected relevant performance measurement data must describe this data. Applicants that have conducted evaluations of their own program or that are replicating other evidence-based programs must describe these evaluations as outlined in the evidence tier descriptions. Applicants are advised to focus on presenting high-quality evidence from up to two of the strongest and most relevant studies while also summarizing the remaining body of evidence that exists for the program. Studies must be evaluations of specific programs or interventions. Research that does not focus on a specific program or intervention, but rather focuses on a broader issue area or population, will not be considered applicable and will not be reviewed or receive any points.					
No evidence: means that the applicant has not provided evidence that they have systematically collected any qualitative or quantitative data to date.				0 points	
Pre-preliminary evidence: means the applicant has demonstrated data collection experience testing or tracking at least one aspect of its logic model.				1-2 points	
Preliminary evidence: means the applicant has provided data from at least one outcome study of their own intervention that yielded promising results for the proposed intervention or that the applicant proposes to replicate a similar intervention with fidelity to the evaluated program model. The ways to demonstrate preliminary level of evidence are: 1. Preliminary with Outcome Study 2. Preliminary with Replication				3-6 points	
Moderate evidence: means the applicant has submitted up to two well-designed and well-implemented studies of their own program that evaluated the same intervention described in this application and identified evidence of effectiveness on one or more key desired outcomes of interest as depicted in the applicant's logic model. Evidence of effectiveness (or positive findings) is determined using experimental design evaluations (i.e., Randomized Controlled Trials (RCT)) or quasi-experimental design evaluations (QED) with statistically matched comparison (i.e., counterfactual) and treatment groups. The ability to generalize the findings from the RCT or QED beyond the study context may be limited (e.g., single-site). The studies were conducted by an independent entity external to the organization implementing the intervention.				7-9 points	
Strong evidence: means the applicant has demonstrated that the intervention described in the application has been tested nationally, regionally, or at the state-level (e.g., multi-site) using a well-designed and well-implemented QED or RCT of their own program. Alternatively, the proposed intervention's evidence may be based on multiple (up to two) well-designed and well-implemented QEDs or RCTs of their own program in different locations or with different populations within a local geographic area. The overall pattern of study findings is consistently positive on the key desired outcomes of interest as depicted in the applicant's logic model. Findings from the RCT or QED studies may be generalized beyond the study context. The studies were conducted by an independent entity external to the organization implementing the intervention.				10-12 points	

Items 5-9 are check boxes within the eGrants Program Information Section. Refer to the Program Information section (after performance measures). However, the areas should also be addressed within the Rational and Approach (Program Design) narrative section.				
5. Notice Priority				
Applicants should only select Priorities that represent a significant part of the program focus, high quality program design, and outcomes.				
Criteria	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. The applicant proposed program fits within one or more of the 2017 AmeriCorps funding priorities as outlined in the Funding Priorities section and more fully described in the Mandatory Supplemental Guidance. 2. The proposed program meets all of the requirements detailed in the Funding Priorities section and in the Mandatory Supplemental Guidance.			3	
6. Member Training				
Criteria	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. AmeriCorps members will receive high quality training to provide effective service. 2. AmeriCorps members and volunteers will be aware of, and will adhere to AmeriCorps requirements including the rules regarding prohibited activities (see Mandatory Supplemental Guidance).			4	
7. Member Supervision				
Criteria	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. AmeriCorps members will receive sufficient guidance and support from their supervisor to provide effective service. 2. AmeriCorps supervisors will be adequately trained/prepared to follow AmeriCorps and program regulations, priorities, and expectations.			2	
8. Member Experience				
Criteria	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. AmeriCorps members will gain skills and experience as a result of their training and service that can be utilized and will be valued by future employers after their service term is completed. 2. AmeriCorps members will have access to meaningful service experiences. 3. AmeriCorps members will have access to opportunities for reflection and connection to the broader National Service network. 4. The program will recruit AmeriCorps members from the geographic or demographic communities in which the programs operate.			3	0
9. Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification				
Criteria	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. Members will know they are AmeriCorps members. 2. Staff and community members where the members are serving will know they are AmeriCorps members.			2	0
B. Program Design (Total Points)			**50**	**0**

C. Organizational Capability (25%)		Responses should be found in the Organizational Capability narrative section. Reviewers will consider the quality of the application's response to the following criteria below. Do not assume all sub-criteria are of equal value.		
1. Organizational Background and Staffing				
Criteria	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses	Possible Points	Points Awarded
The organization has the experience, staffing, and management structure to plan and implement the proposed program.			10	
2. Compliance and Accountability				
Criteria	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses	Possible Points	Points Awarded
1. The organization will comply with AmeriCorps rules and regulations including those related to prohibited and unallowable activities at the grantee, subgrantee (if applicable), and service site locations. 2. The applicant's organization, in implementation and management of its AmeriCorps program, will prevent and detect compliance issues. 3. The applicant will hold subgrantees (if applicable) and service site locations accountable if instances of risk or noncompliance are identified.			15	
		C. Organizational Capability (Total Points)	**25**	**0**

D. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (25%)	Responses should be found in the Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy narrative section. Reviewers will consider the quality of the application's response to the following criteria below. Do not assume all sub-criteria are of equal value.

1. Cost Effectiveness				
Having a low cost per Member Service Year (MSY) is a competitive advantage. New applicants that submit with a low cost per MSY and recompeting applicants that submit with a lower cost per MSY than previously funded may receive higher priority for funding. Applicants requesting a higher cost per MSY than funded in previous years must justify their requests. If an applicant requests above the maximum cost per MSY, it must justify its request.				
Evaluation Guidelines	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. The budget is sufficient to carry out the program effectively.* 2. The budget aligns with the applicant's narrative.* 3. The applicant has raised or describes an adequate plan to raise non-CNCS resources to fully support the program. 4. The applicant, if recompeting, has a lower cost per Member Service Year (MSY – see Mandatory Supplemental Guidance) than approved in previous grants, or provides a compelling rationale for the same or increased cost including why this increase could not be covered by the grantee share.			18	
Program costs not included in the formal budget, including for Fixed Price grantees, must be described in this section in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to assess their sufficiency and alignment. Failure to provide adequate information in this section may result in a lower score.				

2. Budget Adequacy				
Evaluation Guidelines	**Yes/No**	**Comments on strengths and weaknesses**	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**
1. Budget is submitted without mathematical errors and proposed costs are allowable, reasonable, and allocable to the award. 2. Budget is submitted with adequate information to assess how each line item is calculated. 3. Budget is in compliance with the budget instructions. 4. Match is submitted with adequate information to support the amount written in the budget.			7	
Applicants must complete the budget and ensure the following information is in the budget narrative (requested information in the budget screens): 1. Identify the non-CNCS funding and resources necessary to support the project, including for Fixed Price applicants. 2. Indicate the amount of non-CNCS resource commitments, type of commitments (in-kind and/or cash) and the sources of these commitments				
ADDITIONAL Kentucky AmeriCorps Budget Requirements: a. Programs must budget for travel costs for members and staff to attend "Launch," an annual event including training and a swearing-in ceremony, which marks the kick off the AmeriCorps service year. The Launch is traditionally a 2-day event held in Central Kentucky. b. The KCCVS expects budgets to include the equivalent of 100% usage of a full-time program director.				
D. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (Total Points)			**25**	**0**

E. Evaluation Plan (0%) *Required for recompeting grantees*	**Responses should be found in the Evaluation Summary or Plan narrative section.** *(Recompete applicants ONLY.)* Reviewers will consider the quality of the application's response to the following criteria below. Do not assume all sub-criteria are of equal value.

If the applicant is competing for the first time, please enter N/A in the "Evaluation Summary or Plan" field since it pertains only to recompeting grantees. If the applicant is recompeting for AmeriCorps funds for the first time (see definition of "recompeting" below) the program must submit its evaluation plan in the "Evaluation Summary or Plan" section of the Narratives field in eGrants. If the applicant is recompeting for a subsequent time, the program must submit its evaluation report (see the Submission of Additional Documents section for more information), as well as an evaluation plan for the next three-year period in the "Evaluation Plan" field in eGrants. Evaluations plans submitted outside of eGrants will not be reviewed.

Evaluation Guidelines	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses	Possible Points	Points Awarded
Evaluation plans must include as much information as possible for each of the following: 1. A short description of the theory of change - why the proposed intervention is expected to produce the proposed results 2. Outcome of interest - clear and measurable outcomes that are aligned with the theory of change and will be assessed during the evaluation 3. Research questions to be addressed by the study - concrete research questions (or hypotheses) that are clearly connected to the outcomes 4. Study components – a) a proposed research design for the evaluation including a rationale for the design selected, an assessment of its strengths and limitations, and a description of the main components; b) description of the sampling methods, measurement tools, and data collection procedures, and c) an analysis plan 5. Qualifications needed for the evaluator 6. The estimated budget.			0	0
E. Evaluation Plan (Total Points)			**0**	**0**

Evaluation Guidelines	Yes/No	Comments on strengths and weaknesses	Possible Points	Points Awarded
F. Amendment Justification (0%)		Enter N/A. This field will be used if the applicant is awarded a grant and needs to amend it.	0	0
G. Clarification Information (0%)		Enter N/A. This field will be used to enter information that requires clarification in the post-review period.	0	0
H. Continuation Changes (0%)		Enter N/A. This field will be used to enter changes in the application narratives in continuation requests.	0	0
E-H (Total Points)			**0**	**0**
Total Points			**100**	**0**